

A CHANGE IN THE SENTINEL—TO OUR READERS.

Having just completed the third volume of our Daily paper, we are enabled to carry out to-morrow a purpose which we have for some time past entertained. That purpose is the suspension of our Daily paper until a few weeks before the meeting of the Thirty-fourth Congress. Of course the Tri-Weekly and Weekly Sentinel will be unchanged. They will be issued as regularly as they have been from the establishment of our enterprise.

Most of our subscribers take our Tri-Weekly issue. They live at a distance from the Metropolis and get the Tri-Weekly paper with the same regularity and frequency with which they would get the Daily. Moreover, in the recess of Congress, particularly in the long nine months recess, there is really little, if any necessity for a daily newspaper here. Everybody knows that Washington is not a commercial place, and hence there is no business necessity for a daily paper. If there were, the daily papers established here, before we entered the arena, would be amply adequate to meet the exigency.

From the beginning we have sought to establish for the Sentinel, not a local, but a general character. We have not looked to this city to sustain us either by subscription or advertising. Of course we acknowledge with gratitude the kindness of those who have contributed to the support of our enterprise—but the generous help we have received here was more an incident than an aim.

The City of Washington is known to be, to a great extent, under the influence and control of the Federal Government, which, under the present administration, has withheld from us the encouragement and support that, as a Democratic Journal, we had a right to expect, an encouragement, and a support which it has rendered to other Journals of opposite and conflicting politics.

We desire to be useful to the country at large. We desire ample time for the preparation of our editorial articles, and as we have none of the Government advertising, which three of the daily newspapers here enjoy; as the expense of a Daily paper in Washington is immense, and as we can perhaps make the Sentinel more interesting and useful, by changing it from a Daily to a Tri-Weekly paper, we have determined to do so. We propose to issue it on Tuesday, Thursday, and Saturday of every week. Our readers will bear in mind that this is but a suspension of our Daily paper. A few weeks before the meeting of Congress we will resume, and with additional force, our Daily issue.

MORE PROOFS AGAINST THE KNOW-NOTHINGS.

On Friday, the 28th day of July, 1854, at the 1st Session of the 33d Congress, Mr. Eliot, a Massachusetts whig, moved to suspend the rules in order to enable him to introduce a bill to repeal the fugitive slave law. The yeas and nays were called on the motion, and the vote was as follows:

YEAS—Messrs. Ball, Bennett, Benson, Campbell, Carpenter, Corwin, Crocker, Thomas Davis, De Witt, Dick, Dickinson, Eastman, Edwards, Thos. D. Eliot, Everett, Giddings, Goodrich, Aaron Harlan, Howe, Daniel T. Jones, Knox, Matteson, Mayall, Morgan, Norton, Parker, Pennington, Pringle, David Ritchie, Schell, Chittenden, Clark, Clingman, Cobb, Cook, Cox, Craigie, Curtis, John G. Davis, Dawson, Disney, Dowdell, Drinn, Dunbar, Eddy, Edgerton, Edmundson, John M. Elliott, Ellison, Ellinger, Farley, Faulkner, Foxworth, Fuller, Gooden, Greenwood, Grow, Sampson, W. Harris, Wm. P. Harris, Harrison, Haven, Hendricks, Hens, Hibbard, Hill, Houston, Hunt, Johnson, George W. Jones, Roland Jones, Keitt, Kirk, Kidwell, Kittledge, Kirtz, Lamb, Latham, Letchler, Lewis, McMillen, McNair, McQueen, May, Maurice, Maxwell, John G. Miller, Smith, Miller, Milson, Morrison, Murray, Nichols, Noble, Olin, Andrew Oliver, Orr, Peckham, Phelps, Phillips, Pratt, Preston, Puryear, Reese, Riddle, Robbins, Rogers, Rufin, Seward, Shannon, Shaw, Sherwood, Skelton, Samuel A. Smith, William R. Smith, George W. Smyth, Sellers, Frederick S. Stanton, Richard H. Stanton, Alex. H. Stephens, Hester L. Stevens, Stratton, David Stuart, John J. Taylor, John L. Taylor, Nathaniel G. Taylor, John V. Vansant, Walker, Wheeler, Daniel B. Wright, Hendrick B. Wright, and Zollieffer—120.

Nearly, if not all, who voted for Mr. Eliot's motion were Whigs—a motion in effect to abolish the Fugitive Slave law. The Democratic party voted *en masse* against it. Those Whigs who voted for it were Northern Whigs. We repeat and repeat now what we said on the 30th day of July, when we commented on those proceedings. It is as follows:

"Nor is this the only contrast presented by an analysis of the vote. There is nearly as striking a contrast between the Northern and the Southern Whigs. The former, with several lonesome exceptions, going for it, and the latter in a body against it.

"This vote makes distinctly apparent to the country two important facts. The first is, that there is but one sound national political organization in the country, and that is the great Democratic party. The other is, that in respect to the Constitution as a basis of organization, there is no National Whig party. On the most vital constitutional question, the Whigs of the North and the Whigs of the South have separated. A complete antagonism exists between them. The first have as plainly shown through their representatives in Congress as they have in their public meetings and in their newspapers, that their chief and controlling motive is to war upon slavery—to deprive it of the protection of the Constitution, and to strike down the defenses with which the founders of the government wisely and justly surrounded it. The latter have stood shoulder to shoulder with the Democratic party in maintenance of

the constitutional and legal guarantees provided for in the institution of slavery.

"This is one of the most distinct and unequivocal signs of the times, and should serve as a warning, if warning were needed, to the Whigs of the South.

"When the Whigs of the North proclaim, in the face of the whole country, that the cement that holds them together is hatred of southern men and southern institutions—that they are determined to outface the first and to break down the last—when they proclaim this Vandal purpose in Congress and out of Congress, in public and in private—when they make this declaration at all times and places, it is not possible to conceive of a continued union between the North and the Southern Whigs.

"Men loth to renounce their old party associations, may endeavor to solace themselves with the thought, that while they are at daggers drawn with their quondam northern associates on this great question, there are yet other subjects on which they can agree. We tell such that they would do themselves and their country a grievous wrong. This question is the absorbing and vital question. The Northern Whigs have made it the Aaron's rod that swallows up all other rods, and unless the Southern Whigs have determined to give their cheek to the smiter and their property to the spoiler, they cannot longer affiliate with their northern brethren."

Now, what has become of the Northern Whigs who in and out of Congress were in favor of the repeal of the Fugitive Slave law? They have, with very few, if any exceptions, united themselves with the abolitionized Know-nothings of the Northern States. All the recent elections prove this. We have, from time to time, elaborately and in detail cited the evidences of it.

What has become of the Southern Whigs, who in Congress and out of Congress opposed this motion? Are they not in the same organization in the South. We fear, we believe, we almost know, that the great majority of them are. Nor do we here, or at any time, mean to accuse Southern men of being Abolitionists. They quit the Northern Whigs because the Northern Whigs, after fooling them for years, at last proved to them by gradual encroachments, that they were Abolitionists. Quitting them, they did not know where to go. Much to their relief, the Know-nothing organization, pretending to "ignore" slavery, sprang up in the North, at this crisis. They joined that organization. But after seducing them, the Northern Know-nothings, but as "ignoring" slavery is, at last refused, like the Hon. Mr. Burlingame and Senator Wilson, of Massachusetts, to stick to this insistent process called "ignoring." They grew impatient at the North, the Know-nothings, and they came out distinctly and rankly against slavery, as they used to do before they cloaked and masked themselves under the disguise of Know-nothingism.

Now we behold a great organization that boasts of its extension from the extreme north to the extreme south, from abolitionized Massachusetts to slavholding Texas. We behold Southern Whigs associated and affiliated with Northern Abolitionists, infinitely worse than the Whigs from whom our southern brethren indignantly separated.

We know that the objects of these northern and southern Know-nothings are different, as regards the slavery question. The first are free, and the last true. But the true men, we fear, are stupidly playing a political game of blind man's bluff, and permitting their dishonest associates to lead them into a secret society which would disgrace a despotism—a society which is as much defiled by deception as it is cloaked in mystery.

Where, meanwhile, is the great, honest National Democratic party? It is in its old place. It is everywhere, as it is in Virginia—opposed to Northern Know-nothingism and opposed to Northern Abolitionism. It will die in its tracks before it will surrender to either.

VICTOR HUGO'S SPEECH—FRENCH AND AMERICAN IDEAS OF LIBERTY.

All the oppressions of a despotic government are most melancholy. They are melancholy in their exertions, in their social severances, in their cold-blooded cruelties, and in their stifling of noble and lofty impulses. But they are most melancholy in this—that those brave and generous spirits, within whose hearts burn the light of liberty, and who will not be crushed and ground down, are induced by these oppressions to embrace distempered views of liberty. One extreme, in this imperfect world, begets the opposite extreme. Extreme despotism begets in the minds of those who oppose it—an extreme and a licentious sense of liberty. Of France, this is especially true. Her revolutions have been frantic convulsions, blazing conflagrations that consumed even those who originated them. They have always, in their efforts to attain freedom, lost sight of moderation and conservatism.

We were aware that the celebrated Victor Hugo was a Republican and a poet, but he had never dreamed, until very lately, that he was so Red a Republican, and so wild a poet. We thought that he had a solid substratum of common sense. We are sorry to find that we were in error.

He recently delivered an address "to the exiles of Europe, on the anniversary of the French revolution." It is full of poetry, full of eloquence, and full of humanity. But it is in many places full of nonsense. He gravely proposes that some of our Northern lunatics propose—that women shall be allowed the right of suffrage. He says:

foundations of progress by progress; science struggling with creation; workshops always open, whose doors poverty had only to push, in order to become transformed into labor; should always open, whose doors ignorance had only to push, in order to become transformed into intelligence; gratuitous and obligatory academies, where capacities only should mark the limits of instruction, and where the child of the poor should receive the same culture as the child of the rich; polls, where women might vote as well as men; for the Old World finds women equal to civil, commercial and penal responsibilities; it finds woman equal to imprisonment, to Cliehy, to the bagno, to the dungeon, to the scaffold. As for us, we shall find women good enough for dignity and for liberty; it finds woman good enough for slavery and death, we shall find her good enough for life; it recognizes woman as a public personage for sufferings and pains and penalties, we shall recognize her as a public personage for justice and right. We shall not say—soul of the first quality, MAN; soul of secondary quality, woman! We shall proclaim woman as our equal, with respect to the more. Oh woman, wife, mother, sister, companion, eternal minor, eternal slave, eternal victim, eternal martyr, we will raise you up!

We will not gravely discuss the subject of women's rights, even with so intellectual a man as the great Victor Hugo. It is beneath his intellect, and to an Anglo-Saxon, beneath contempt.

It is by such extravagances as this that the French loss liberty and become subject to despotisms. French philosophers are too often sublimated poets, who expect, in this cold practical world, poetic justice. They confound moral maxims with legal enactments, and think that what they express in beautiful phraseology, can be accomplished with the same ease with which the words are spoken. They confound words with things—ideas with deeds—visions with realizations. What they want is sound practical sense, and Anglo-Saxon conservatism.

The great Frenchman—his is great—as an idealist, thus defines freedom:

"Freedom to do and come, freedom to associate, freedom to possess, freedom to speak and to write, freedom to think, freedom to love, freedom to believe—all these liberties would form a people among the citizens sheltered by them and become inviolable."

Now, we enjoy all these privileges, franchises, and liberties in this country, and yet women are not allowed to vote. But the French poet and politician thinks that the extension of suffrage to women is essential to liberty.

But there are other points in this address of the great Frenchman that challenge severe criticism. He is evidently more of the Poet than the statesman. He dreams bright dreams that he thinks may be realized—dreams to fulfill which, all the French Patriots in all the French Revolutions have bathed France with blood.

French Philosophers, the most learned of all, and French Patriots, the sincerest of all, have one thing to learn. It is that they have to take human nature as it is. They cannot accomplish impossibilities. They cannot pluck the moon or the stars from the heavens. They can no more extract rational freedom from licentious liberty, than from grinding despotism.

The address of Victor Hugo abounds in eloquence and poetry. We might quote many sentiments of that character. We will content ourselves with one. He says:

"Progress is the very stride of God." But even here he commits what all his revolutionary predecessors have committed. He forgets that progress in the best cause has a limit. All human things have a limit. If Frenchmen would observe this law of limit, they would accomplish far more for the freedom of their country, than they ever have accomplished.

A revolution must be a sensible, well considered and conservative revolution—or it will end in barren bloodshed, and fixed despotism.

LETTER FROM MR. SOULE.

Some days ago a statement appeared in the New York Times, which, after mentioning that Mr. Soule had suddenly changed his bearing towards the administration, stated that the change was produced by the discovery, on the part of Mr. Soule, that Mr. Perry, his Secretary of Legation had made certain communications to the Department of State. According to the article in the Times, those communications reflected so severely on the official conduct of Mr. Soule, as to induce him to avoid any issue with the government, for fear of his publication. The National Intelligencer copied the leading statement of the Times, and, by doing so, called from Mr. Soule the following letter:

NEW YORK, METROPOLITAN HOTEL, March 22, 1855.

To the Editors of the National Intelligencer: Messrs. Editors: My attention has just been called to a republication which appeared in your number of the 19th instant of an article from the New York Times of the 17th, alluding to a certain surreptitious correspondence, held, it would seem, between H. T. Perry, esq., my Secretary of Legation at Madrid, and the Department of State at Washington, and enclosing letters which had passed between that gentleman and myself subsequent to my departure from Spain in August last.

Had not the article of the "Times" gone beyond that paper I should have avoided noticing its contents; but when the grave Intelligencer hesitates not to transfer it to its columns, I may well surrender what principles I had against thrusting myself on the attention of the public, and be permitted to hazard a word of answer.

The article of the Times intimates that my reserve and discretion since my return to Washington could only be induced by the apprehension that the above correspondence should be sent to the public; and you, sir, not only seem to endorse that intimation, but strive to make it more significant by the remark that the story narrated in it "is of too much interest to be withheld from your readers, for, although it is calculated to mystify, more light may soon be thrown on the subject."

I had imagined that your keen sight, Messrs.

Editors, could hardly be obscured by the mists of such a narrative, as I have some reason to know that very early, and long before the date of the publication in the Times, you had obtained access to the very papers alluded to in it. You ought from their perusal to have acquired the conviction that I could in no manner object to their being exposed to the public gaze. You certainly might, at any time, have obtained my fiat for giving them entire to your readers.

If it be true that, in my Secretary of Legation, in the very man I had taken to my bosom, though he belonged not to my political creed, I had a spy and a traitor, it will never hurt me to let the world know how he carried on the infamous trade.

Please, sir, insert this letter in your next number, and believe me your very humble and obedient servant.

PIERRE SOULE.

The National Intelligencer in publishing the foregoing letter, subjoins the following comments:

"Since Mr. Soule has thought proper to admit the existence of the correspondence alluded to by the article of the New York Times, copied into the Intelligencer, we might forego any observations on the Letter which he has done us the honor to address to us; but it may not be improper for us to make one or two remarks upon it. First, we did not 'obtain access' to the correspondence referred to. A copy of it was voluntarily but confidentially placed in our hands for perusal in February, (not, however, by Mr. Perry, with whom we had no correspondence, direct or indirect,) and we respected that confidence by abstaining from any reference to the letters until we found the statement in the New York Journal. Secondly, in copying the Times' article, we excluded those personal passages which we supposed Mr. Soule could take just exception to. Thirdly, as our observations on the Letter which he has done us the honor to address to us; but it may not be improper for us to make one or two remarks upon it. First, we did not 'obtain access' to the correspondence referred to. A copy of it was voluntarily but confidentially placed in our hands for perusal in February, (not, however, by Mr. Perry, with whom we had no correspondence, direct or indirect,) and we respected that confidence by abstaining from any reference to the letters until we found the statement in the New York Journal. Secondly, in copying the Times' article, we excluded those personal passages which we supposed Mr. Soule could take just exception to. Thirdly, as our observations on the Letter which he has done us the honor to address to us; but it may not be improper for us to make one or two remarks upon it. First, we did not 'obtain access' to the correspondence referred to. A copy of it was voluntarily but confidentially placed in our hands for perusal in February, (not, however, by Mr. Perry, with whom we had no correspondence, direct or indirect,) and we respected that confidence by abstaining from any reference to the letters until we found the statement in the New York Journal. Secondly, in copying the Times' article, we excluded those personal passages which we supposed Mr. Soule could take just exception to. Thirdly, as our observations on the Letter which he has done us the honor to address to us; but it may not be improper for us to make one or two remarks upon it. First, we did not 'obtain access' to the correspondence referred to. A copy of it was voluntarily but confidentially placed in our hands for perusal in February, (not, however, by Mr. Perry, with whom we had no correspondence, direct or indirect,) and we respected that confidence by abstaining from any reference to the letters until we found the statement in the New York Journal. Secondly, in copying the Times' article, we excluded those personal passages which we supposed Mr. Soule could take just exception to. Thirdly, as our observations on the Letter which he has done us the honor to address to us; but it may not be improper for us to make one or two remarks upon it. First, we did not 'obtain access' to the correspondence referred to. A copy of it was voluntarily but confidentially placed in our hands for perusal in February, (not, however, by Mr. Perry, with whom we had no correspondence, direct or indirect,) and we respected that confidence by abstaining from any reference to the letters until we found the statement in the New York Journal. Secondly, in copying the Times' article, we excluded those personal passages which we supposed Mr. Soule could take just exception to. Thirdly, as our observations on the Letter which he has done us the honor to address to us; but it may not be improper for us to make one or two remarks upon it. First, we did not 'obtain access' to the correspondence referred to. A copy of it was voluntarily but confidentially placed in our hands for perusal in February, (not, however, by Mr. Perry, with whom we had no correspondence, direct or indirect,) and we respected that confidence by abstaining from any reference to the letters until we found the statement in the New York Journal. Secondly, in copying the Times' article, we excluded those personal passages which we supposed Mr. Soule could take just exception to. Thirdly, as our observations on the Letter which he has done us the honor to address to us; but it may not be improper for us to make one or two remarks upon it. First, we did not 'obtain access' to the correspondence referred to. A copy of it was voluntarily but confidentially placed in our hands for perusal in February, (not, however, by Mr. Perry, with whom we had no correspondence, direct or indirect,) and we respected that confidence by abstaining from any reference to the letters until we found the statement in the New York Journal. Secondly, in copying the Times' article, we excluded those personal passages which we supposed Mr. Soule could take just exception to. Thirdly, as our observations on the Letter which he has done us the honor to address to us; but it may not be improper for us to make one or two remarks upon it. First, we did not 'obtain access' to the correspondence referred to. A copy of it was voluntarily but confidentially placed in our hands for perusal in February, (not, however, by Mr. Perry, with whom we had no correspondence, direct or indirect,) and we respected that confidence by abstaining from any reference to the letters until we found the statement in the New York Journal. Secondly, in copying the Times' article, we excluded those personal passages which we supposed Mr. Soule could take just exception to. Thirdly, as our observations on the Letter which he has done us the honor to address to us; but it may not be improper for us to make one or two remarks upon it. First, we did not 'obtain access' to the correspondence referred to. A copy of it was voluntarily but confidentially placed in our hands for perusal in February, (not, however, by Mr. Perry, with whom we had no correspondence, direct or indirect,) and we respected that confidence by abstaining from any reference to the letters until we found the statement in the New York Journal. Secondly, in copying the Times' article, we excluded those personal passages which we supposed Mr. Soule could take just exception to. Thirdly, as our observations on the Letter which he has done us the honor to address to us; but it may not be improper for us to make one or two remarks upon it. First, we did not 'obtain access' to the correspondence referred to. A copy of it was voluntarily but confidentially placed in our hands for perusal in February, (not, however, by Mr. Perry, with whom we had no correspondence, direct or indirect,) and we respected that confidence by abstaining from any reference to the letters until we found the statement in the New York Journal. Secondly, in copying the Times' article, we excluded those personal passages which we supposed Mr. Soule could take just exception to. Thirdly, as our observations on the Letter which he has done us the honor to address to us; but it may not be improper for us to make one or two remarks upon it. First, we did not 'obtain access' to the correspondence referred to. A copy of it was voluntarily but confidentially placed in our hands for perusal in February, (not, however, by Mr. Perry, with whom we had no correspondence, direct or indirect,) and we respected that confidence by abstaining from any reference to the letters until we found the statement in the New York Journal. Secondly, in copying the Times' article, we excluded those personal passages which we supposed Mr. Soule could take just exception to. Thirdly, as our observations on the Letter which he has done us the honor to address to us; but it may not be improper for us to make one or two remarks upon it. First, we did not 'obtain access' to the correspondence referred to. A copy of it was voluntarily but confidentially placed in our hands for perusal in February, (not, however, by Mr. Perry, with whom we had no correspondence, direct or indirect,) and we respected that confidence by abstaining from any reference to the letters until we found the statement in the New York Journal. Secondly, in copying the Times' article, we excluded those personal passages which we supposed Mr. Soule could take just exception to. Thirdly, as our observations on the Letter which he has done us the honor to address to us; but it may not be improper for us to make one or two remarks upon it. First, we did not 'obtain access' to the correspondence referred to. A copy of it was voluntarily but confidentially placed in our hands for perusal in February, (not, however, by Mr. Perry, with whom we had no correspondence, direct or indirect,) and we respected that confidence by abstaining from any reference to the letters until we found the statement in the New York Journal. Secondly, in copying the Times' article, we excluded those personal passages which we supposed Mr. Soule could take just exception to. Thirdly, as our observations on the Letter which he has done us the honor to address to us; but it may not be improper for us to make one or two remarks upon it. First, we did not 'obtain access' to the correspondence referred to. A copy of it was voluntarily but confidentially placed in our hands for perusal in February, (not, however, by Mr. Perry, with whom we had no correspondence, direct or indirect,) and we respected that confidence by abstaining from any reference to the letters until we found the statement in the New York Journal. Secondly, in copying the Times' article, we excluded those personal passages which we supposed Mr. Soule could take just exception to. Thirdly, as our observations on the Letter which he has done us the honor to address to us; but it may not be improper for us to make one or two remarks upon it. First, we did not 'obtain access' to the correspondence referred to. A copy of it was voluntarily but confidentially placed in our hands for perusal in February, (not, however, by Mr. Perry, with whom we had no correspondence, direct or indirect,) and we respected that confidence by abstaining from any reference to the letters until we found the statement in the New York Journal. Secondly, in copying the Times' article, we excluded those personal passages which we supposed Mr. Soule could take just exception to. Thirdly, as our observations on the Letter which he has done us the honor to address to us; but it may not be improper for us to make one or two remarks upon it. First, we did not 'obtain access' to the correspondence referred to. A copy of it was voluntarily but confidentially placed in our hands for perusal in February, (not, however, by Mr. Perry, with whom we had no correspondence, direct or indirect,) and we respected that confidence by abstaining from any reference to the letters until we found the statement in the New York Journal. Secondly, in copying the Times' article, we excluded those personal passages which we supposed Mr. Soule could take just exception to. Thirdly, as our observations on the Letter which he has done us the honor to address to us; but it may not be improper for us to make one or two remarks upon it. First, we did not 'obtain access' to the correspondence referred to. A copy of it was voluntarily but confidentially placed in our hands for perusal in February, (not, however, by Mr. Perry, with whom we had no correspondence, direct or indirect,) and we respected that confidence by abstaining from any reference to the letters until we found the statement in the New York Journal. Secondly, in copying the Times' article, we excluded those personal passages which we supposed Mr. Soule could take just exception to. Thirdly, as our observations on the Letter which he has done us the honor to address to us; but it may not be improper for us to make one or two remarks upon it. First, we did not 'obtain access' to the correspondence referred to. A copy of it was voluntarily but confidentially placed in our hands for perusal in February, (not, however, by Mr. Perry, with whom we had no correspondence, direct or indirect,) and we respected that confidence by abstaining from any reference to the letters until we found the statement in the New York Journal. Secondly, in copying the Times' article, we excluded those personal passages which we supposed Mr. Soule could take just exception to. Thirdly, as our observations on the Letter which he has done us the honor to address to us; but it may not be improper for us to make one or two remarks upon it. First, we did not 'obtain access' to the correspondence referred to. A copy of it was voluntarily but confidentially placed in our hands for perusal in February, (not, however, by Mr. Perry, with whom we had no correspondence, direct or indirect,) and we respected that confidence by abstaining from any reference to the letters until we found the statement in the New York Journal. Secondly, in copying the Times' article, we excluded those personal passages which we supposed Mr. Soule could take just exception to. Thirdly, as our observations on the Letter which he has done us the honor to address to us; but it may not be improper for us to make one or two remarks upon it. First, we did not 'obtain access' to the correspondence referred to. A copy of it was voluntarily but confidentially placed in our hands for perusal in February, (not, however, by Mr. Perry, with whom we had no correspondence, direct or indirect,) and we respected that confidence by abstaining from any reference to the letters until we found the statement in the New York Journal. Secondly, in copying the Times' article, we excluded those personal passages which we supposed Mr. Soule could take just exception to. Thirdly, as our observations on the Letter which he has done us the honor to address to us; but it may not be improper for us to make one or two remarks upon it. First, we did not 'obtain access' to the correspondence referred to. A copy of it was voluntarily but confidentially placed in our hands for perusal in February, (not, however, by Mr. Perry, with whom we had no correspondence, direct or indirect,) and we respected that confidence by abstaining from any reference to the letters until we found the statement in the New York Journal. Secondly, in copying the Times' article, we excluded those personal passages which we supposed Mr. Soule could take just exception to. Thirdly, as our observations on the Letter which he has done us the honor to address to us; but it may not be improper for us to make one or two remarks upon it. First, we did not 'obtain access' to the correspondence referred to. A copy of it was voluntarily but confidentially placed in our hands for perusal in February, (not, however, by Mr. Perry, with whom we had no correspondence, direct or indirect,) and we respected that confidence by abstaining from any reference to the letters until we found the statement in the New York Journal. Secondly, in copying the Times' article, we excluded those personal passages which we supposed Mr. Soule could take just exception to. Thirdly, as our observations on the Letter which he has done us the honor to address to us; but it may not be improper for us to make one or two remarks upon it. First, we did not 'obtain access' to the correspondence referred to. A copy of it was voluntarily but confidentially placed in our hands for perusal in February, (not, however, by Mr. Perry, with whom we had no correspondence, direct or indirect,) and we respected that confidence by abstaining from any reference to the letters until we found the statement in the New York Journal. Secondly, in copying the Times' article, we excluded those personal passages which we supposed Mr. Soule could take just exception to. Thirdly, as our observations on the Letter which he has done us the honor to address to us; but it may not be improper for us to make one or two remarks upon it. First, we did not 'obtain access' to the correspondence referred to. A copy of it was voluntarily but confidentially placed in our hands for perusal in February, (not, however, by Mr. Perry, with whom we had no correspondence, direct or indirect,) and we respected that confidence by abstaining from any reference to the letters until we found the statement in the New York Journal. Secondly, in copying the Times' article, we excluded those personal passages which we supposed Mr. Soule could take just exception to. Thirdly, as our observations on the Letter which he has done us the honor to address to us; but it may not be improper for us to make one or two remarks upon it. First, we did not 'obtain access' to the correspondence referred to. A copy of it was voluntarily but confidentially placed in our hands for perusal in February, (not, however, by Mr. Perry, with whom we had no correspondence, direct or indirect,) and we respected that confidence by abstaining from any reference to the letters until we found the statement in the New York Journal. Secondly, in copying the Times' article, we excluded those personal passages which we supposed Mr. Soule could take just exception to. Thirdly, as our observations on the Letter which he has done us the honor to address to us; but it may not be improper for us to make one or two remarks upon it. First, we did not 'obtain access' to the correspondence referred to. A copy of it was voluntarily but confidentially placed in our hands for perusal in February, (not, however, by Mr. Perry, with whom we had no correspondence, direct or indirect,) and we respected that confidence by abstaining from any reference to the letters until we found the statement in the New York Journal. Secondly, in copying the Times' article, we excluded those personal passages which we supposed Mr. Soule could take just exception to. Thirdly, as our observations on the Letter which he has done us the honor to address to us; but it may not be improper for us to make one or two remarks upon it. First, we did not 'obtain access' to the correspondence referred to. A copy of it was voluntarily but confidentially placed in our hands for perusal in February, (not, however, by Mr. Perry, with whom we had no correspondence, direct or indirect,) and we respected that confidence by abstaining from any reference to the letters until we found the statement in the New York Journal. Secondly, in copying the Times' article, we excluded those personal passages which we supposed Mr. Soule could take just exception to. Thirdly, as our observations on the Letter which he has done us the honor to address to us; but it may not be improper for us to make one or two remarks upon it. First, we did not 'obtain access' to the correspondence referred to. A copy of it was voluntarily but confidentially placed in our hands for perusal in February, (not, however, by Mr. Perry, with whom we had no correspondence, direct or indirect,) and we respected that confidence by abstaining from any reference to the letters until we found the statement in the New York Journal. Secondly, in copying the Times' article, we excluded those personal passages which we supposed Mr. Soule could take just exception to. Thirdly, as our observations on the Letter which he has done us the honor to address to us; but it may not be improper for us to make one or two remarks upon it. First, we did not 'obtain access' to the correspondence referred to. A copy of it was voluntarily but confidentially placed in our hands for perusal in February, (not, however, by Mr. Perry, with whom we had no correspondence, direct or indirect,) and we respected that confidence by abstaining from any reference to the letters until we found the statement in the New York Journal. Secondly, in copying the Times' article, we excluded those personal passages which we supposed Mr. Soule could take just exception to. Thirdly, as our observations on the Letter which he has done us the honor to address to us; but it may not be improper for us to make one or two remarks upon it. First, we did not 'obtain access' to the correspondence referred to. A copy of it was voluntarily but confidentially placed in our hands for perusal in February, (not, however, by Mr. Perry, with whom we had no correspondence, direct or indirect,) and we respected that confidence by abstaining from any reference to the letters until we found the statement in the New York Journal. Secondly, in copying the Times' article, we excluded those personal passages which we supposed Mr. Soule could take just exception to. Thirdly, as our observations on the Letter which he has done us the honor to address to us; but it may not be improper for us to make one or two remarks upon it. First, we did not 'obtain access' to the correspondence referred to. A copy of it was voluntarily but confidentially placed in our hands for perusal in February, (not, however, by Mr. Perry, with whom we had no correspondence, direct or indirect,) and we respected that confidence by abstaining from any reference to the letters until we found the statement in the New York Journal. Secondly, in copying the Times' article, we excluded those personal passages which we supposed Mr. Soule could take just exception to. Thirdly, as our observations on the Letter which he has done us the honor to address to us; but it may not be improper for us to make one or two remarks upon it. First, we did not 'obtain access' to the correspondence referred to. A copy of it was voluntarily but confidentially placed in our hands for perusal in February, (not, however, by Mr. Perry, with whom we had no correspondence, direct or indirect,) and we respected that confidence by abstaining from any reference to the letters until we found the statement in the New York Journal. Secondly, in copying the Times' article, we excluded those personal passages which we supposed Mr. Soule could take just exception to. Thirdly, as our observations on the Letter which he has done us the honor to address to us; but it may not be improper for us to make one or two remarks upon it. First, we did not 'obtain access' to the correspondence referred to. A copy of it was voluntarily but confidentially placed in our hands for perusal in February, (not, however, by Mr. Perry, with whom we had no correspondence, direct or indirect,) and we respected that confidence by abstaining from any reference to the letters until we found the statement in the New York Journal. Secondly, in copying the Times' article, we excluded those personal passages which we supposed Mr. Soule could take just exception to. Thirdly, as our observations on the Letter which he has done us the honor to address to us; but it may not be improper for us to make one or two remarks upon it. First, we did not 'obtain access' to the correspondence referred to. A copy of it was voluntarily but confidentially placed in our hands for perusal in February, (not, however, by Mr. Perry, with whom we had no correspondence, direct or indirect,) and we respected that confidence by abstaining from any reference to the letters until we found the statement in the New York Journal. Secondly, in copying the Times' article, we excluded those personal passages which we supposed Mr. Soule could take just exception to. Thirdly, as our observations on the Letter which he has done us the honor to address to us; but it may not be improper for us to make one or two remarks upon it. First, we did not 'obtain access' to the correspondence referred to. A copy of it was voluntarily but confidentially placed in our hands for perusal in February, (not, however, by Mr. Perry, with whom we had no correspondence, direct or indirect,) and we respected that confidence by abstaining from any reference to the letters until we found the statement in the New York Journal. Secondly, in copying the Times' article, we excluded those personal passages which we supposed Mr. Soule could take just exception to. Thirdly, as our observations on the Letter which he has done us the honor to address to us; but it may not be improper for us to make one or two remarks upon it. First, we did not 'obtain access' to the correspondence referred to. A copy of it was voluntarily but confidentially placed in our hands for perusal in February, (not, however, by Mr. Perry, with whom we had no correspondence, direct or indirect,) and we respected that confidence by abstaining from any reference to the letters until we found the statement in the New York Journal. Secondly, in copying the Times' article, we excluded those personal passages which we supposed Mr. Soule could take just exception to. Thirdly, as our observations on the Letter which he has done us the honor to address to us; but it may not be improper for us to make one or two remarks upon it. First, we did not 'obtain access' to the correspondence referred to. A copy of it was voluntarily but confidentially placed in our hands for perusal in February, (not, however, by Mr. Perry, with whom we had no correspondence, direct or indirect,) and we respected that confidence by abstaining from any reference to the letters until we found the statement in the New York Journal. Secondly, in copying the Times' article, we excluded those personal passages which we supposed Mr. Soule could take just exception to. Thirdly, as our observations on the Letter which he has done us the honor to address to us; but it may not be improper for us to make one or two remarks upon it. First, we did not 'obtain access' to the correspondence referred to. A copy of it was voluntarily but confidentially placed in our hands for perusal in February, (not, however, by Mr. Perry, with whom we had no correspondence, direct or indirect,) and we respected that confidence by abstaining from any reference to the letters until we found the statement in the New York Journal. Secondly, in copying the Times' article, we excluded those personal passages which we supposed Mr. Soule could take just exception to. Thirdly, as our observations on the Letter which he has done us the honor to address to us; but it may not be improper for us to make one or two remarks upon it. First, we did not 'obtain access' to the correspondence referred to. A copy of it was voluntarily but confidentially placed in our hands for perusal in February, (not, however, by Mr. Perry, with whom we had no correspondence, direct or indirect,) and we respected that confidence by abstaining from any reference to the letters until we found the statement in the New York Journal. Secondly, in copying the Times' article, we excluded those personal passages which we supposed Mr. Soule could take just exception to. Thirdly, as our observations on the Letter which he has done us the honor to address to us; but it may not be improper for us to make one or two remarks upon it. First, we did not 'obtain access' to the correspondence referred to. A copy of it was voluntarily but confidentially placed in our hands for perusal in February, (not, however, by Mr. Perry, with whom we had no correspondence, direct or indirect,) and we respected that confidence by abstaining from any reference to the letters until we found the statement in the New York Journal. Secondly, in copying the Times' article, we excluded those personal passages which we supposed Mr. Soule could take just exception to. Thirdly, as our observations on the Letter which he has done us the honor to address to us; but it may not be improper for us to make one or two remarks upon it. First, we did not 'obtain access' to the correspondence referred to. A copy of it was voluntarily but confidentially placed in our hands for perusal in February, (not, however, by Mr. Perry, with whom we had no correspondence, direct or indirect,) and we respected that confidence by abstaining from any reference to the letters until we found the statement in the New York Journal. Secondly, in copying the Times' article, we excluded those personal passages which we supposed Mr. Soule could take just exception to. Thirdly, as our observations on the Letter which he has done us the honor to address to us; but it may not be improper for us to make one or two remarks upon it. First, we did not 'obtain access' to the correspondence referred to. A copy of it was voluntarily but confidentially placed in our hands for perusal in February, (not, however, by Mr. Perry, with whom we had no correspondence, direct or indirect,) and we respected that confidence by abstaining from any reference to the letters until we found the statement in the New York Journal. Secondly, in copying the Times' article, we excluded those personal passages which we supposed Mr. Soule could take just exception to. Thirdly, as our observations on the Letter which he has done us the honor to address to us; but it may not be improper for us to make one or two remarks upon it. First, we did not 'obtain access' to the correspondence referred to. A copy of it was voluntarily but confidentially placed in our hands for perusal in February, (not, however, by Mr. Perry, with whom we had no correspondence, direct or indirect,) and we respected that confidence by abstaining from any reference to the letters until we found the statement in the New York Journal. Secondly, in copying the Times' article, we excluded those personal passages which we supposed Mr. Soule could take just exception to. Thirdly, as our observations on the Letter which he has done us the honor to address to us; but it may not be improper for us to make one or two remarks upon it. First, we did not 'obtain access' to the correspondence referred to. A copy of it was voluntarily but confidentially placed in our hands for perusal in February, (not, however, by Mr. Perry, with whom we had no correspondence, direct or indirect,) and we respected that confidence by abstaining from any reference to the letters until we found the statement in the New York Journal. Secondly, in copying the Times' article, we excluded those personal passages which we supposed Mr. Soule could take just exception to. Thirdly, as our observations on the Letter which he has done us the honor to address to us; but it may not be improper for us to make one or two remarks upon it. First, we did not 'obtain access' to the correspondence referred to. A copy of it was voluntarily but confidentially placed in our hands for perusal in February